

### REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on October 31, 2007. Claims 1-18 and 20-21 were pending. With this amendment, claims 1 and 18 are amended and claim 6 is canceled, and the remaining claims are unchanged in the application.

On page two of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5 and 7-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rettig et al. US Patent No. 6252589 in view of Bennett et al. US Publication No. 2002/0052910 A1. Of the rejected claims, claim 1 is an independent claim, and Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

At the outset, it is worth noting that the manifest file in the present claims facilitates location of appropriate resources by an operating system. The manifest file maps an identifier of a resource to be retrieved to a location of the resource in the appropriate resource pack. Different resource packs are associated with different languages. For example, a machine may be used by a Japanese user and therefore have a Japanese resource pack. A system setting indicates which resource pack is to be utilized. When a specific resource (such as a dialog box) is to be retrieved during runtime, instantiation of the language neutral code portion 303 of the application 301 calls code controlling manifest 313 with an identifier associated with the desired dialog box (i.e., with the desired resource to be loaded). The code controlling the manifest returns an indication of the specific location of the desired dialog box in the Japanese resource pack, which is itself identified by the system setting.

In order to meet the resource manifest file limitations of the first two elements of claim 1, the Examiner cited the Rettig et al. reference, specifically, column 3, lines 1-18. However, it should be noted that the cited portion of Rettig is discussing a prior operating system which required an application to precisely identify "the appropriate language resource and where it is located." In other words, this required the application, itself, to know the precise location of the specific resource (such as a dialog box) to be loaded. Therefore, the application was required to know where the various language resources were stored in the system.

Of course, in the present system, this is not so. Instead, the particular language of the resource pack to be used is identified by a system setting. Then, in order to obtain the specific location of a specific resource that is to be loaded during runtime, the present system does not require the application to “identify precisely the appropriate language resource and where it is located.” Instead, the present system provides the resource manifest file which maps the specific location of resources in a given resource pack to resource identifiers that identify the specific resources. Therefore, the only thing that the application is required to know is the identity of the resource, and that identifier is used by the resource manifest to obtain the location of that resource.

More specifically with respect to claim 1, the method includes “creating a language-neutral file and a language-specific resource file having a plurality of language-specific resources by reading localizable resource information contained in the resource manifest file, the localizable resource information specifying locations of specific resources to be retrieved during runtime from the language-specific resource file, the locations of the specific resources being mapped to resource identifiers used by applications to identify the specific resources within the language-specific resource file, in the resource manifest file, the resource manifest file further specifying a type of resource to be retrieved, and indicating whether the resource is localizable...”.

It can thus be seen that claim 1 specifically sets out that the resource manifest file obviates the need for the application to know the precise location of any given resource in a desired language. Thus, Applicant submits that the cited portion of Rettig neither teaches nor suggests this. Applicant thus submits that independent claim 1 is allowable over the references cited by the Examiner.

With respect to claim 18, the Examiner again cited Rettig column 3, lines 8-18 as teaching the creating of a resource manifest file. However, there is no teaching or suggestion, in the cited portion of Rettig, of any type of resource manifest file. Instead, the cited portion of Rettig discusses a prior system in which the application was required to know the precise location of a given resource.

By contrast, independent claim 18 includes “creating a resource manifest file, the resource manifest file mapping locations of specific resources to be retrieved during runtime, within a language-specific resource file that has a plurality of language-specific resources, to resource identifiers used by an application to identify the specific resources...”. It is thus clear that, far from requiring an application to know the precise location of different resources, independent claim 18 claims that the resource manifest file will provide that location, given a resource identifier. Thus, the cited portion of Rettig neither teaches or suggests the invention set out in independent claim 18.

Claims 2-5 and 7-17 depend either directly or ultimately from independent claim 1. Claims 20-21 depend from independent claim 18. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 2-5, 7-17 and 20-21 are allowable as well. Applicant therefore requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-5, 7-18 and 20-21.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Joseph R. Kelly/  
Joseph R. Kelly, Reg. No. 34,847  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JRK:slg